NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES
297 FOURTH AVENUE
NEW YORK 10, N. Y.

NEW CHRISTIAN

Dec. 1955 Edited by Kenneth Leslie

PEARSON'S "MEASURED RETALIATION"

A NEW CHRISTIAN CHURCH

INTERPRETING THE NEWS

By Louise Harding

Vol. XI, No. 12 30 cents

PEARSON'S "MEASURED RETALIATION"

Is it possible to measure out modern atomic war as one would measure out lashes in a flogging or days of confinement in a jail?

To measure anything one must be in control (1) of oneself and (2) of the thing to be measured.

But in war of any kind the control becomes alienated. It passes from the diplomat to the general, from the man of the word to the man of the sword, who proves his worth in victory. In measuring out his victory his hand will be more anxious to *make sure* of it than to *measure* it.

It is assumed by the advocates of "measured" war that the weapons used will be "tactical", that is, only aimed at the soldiers of the enemy and not at civilians. But in atomic war of any kind will there not be competition in these weapons? And at what precise point in the explosive potential are both sides to stop? Supposing that one side goes beyond the conventional limit of explosiveness? Will not the other side push up that limit? What other recourse will there be? And how long will it be before we have a full-fledged atomic conflict?

The Premise of Controlled Warfare:

If there existed a world organization or a group of allies, call them "free nations" if you wish, with a united positive will for the world, possessing at least 90% of the world's military power, this might constitute an adequate premise upon which to build plans for the controlled military punishment of nations defying the organization.

But since power is fairly evenly distributed between the socialist system and the capitalist system, and since the socialist bloc is united around a positive purpose whereas the capitalist bloc is wired together solely by its anti-socialism, it becomes difficult for the ordinary prosaic soul to share the wishful dreams of certain of our statesmen.

It was in a lecture at Princeton last spring that the Canadian Minister of External Affairs, Mr. Lester Pearson, developed or advocated the development by the Wset of a doctrine of "reasonable or measured retaliation" in dealing with the Russian cold war threat.

This was probably meant to modify or tone down previous threats by other statesmen of "massive retaliation."

Mr. Pearson's doctrine is: "If force is used against you, that does not necessarily justify using more in retaliation than is needed for the purpose." Recently, in a television interview given after a visit to Russia, Mr. Pearson appeared to be quite convinced that the Russians will not start a thermonuclear (H-Bomb) war, but... "They are not going to risk that kind of war but they probably haven't given up the pursuit of their objectives by any means short of that kind of war, so we should be on our guard."

What is to be made of all this?

A Canadian Press dispatch from Ottawa (Nov. 30) reports the feeling of officials in that capital as follows:

(1) East and West have reached a nuclear stalemate. There will be no full-scale nuclear wars.

(2) But Russia may strike out in small-scale wars. For instance, she may use force in Iran.

(3) If she does such a thing the Pearson doctrine would come into effect. That is, the West would use *measured retaliation.*

H-Bombs being ruled out, we would use "tactical atomic weapons." These are atomic artillery and guided missiles directed against hostile military forces rather than (as at Hiroshima) against civilians.

But at whose discretion will the fateful decisions be made as to what is military and what is civilian? Once the "measured retaliation" has begun to be applied will it not be under the direction of the armed forces command? And will there not be room for disagreement by the enemy as to the application of the rules of measurement?

Does Mr. Pearson seriously think that the trigger fingers of men in control of atomic weapons can themselves be controlled once they have been loosed upon an enemy? And can the enemy be depended upon to remain within the stipulated category of atomic weapons?

It appears to us that this idea of Mr. Pearson's is extremely dangerous and provocative. First we go over to the very borders of the Soviet Union to a country (Iran) which has an iron-bound treaty of neutrality with the Soviet Union and we engage that country in a pact of hostility to the Soviet Union. Then we virtually threaten the Soviet Union that if she tries to rectify this intolerable situation we may unleash against her a "measured" atomic war.

This, we gravely fear, is meant to pave the way for the opening gambit of *the war of which the whole earth is in terror.* We do not mean that Mr. Pearson intends it as such, but as far as we can see *it can have no other meaning.*

What it says is that we cannot face *the idea* of a major war, so we will contemplate minor wars. But these minor wars, certainly minor wars *using atomic weapons,* will lead inevitably to the major war, the holocaust.

Well, we have had "containment", "liberation", "dynamic initiative", "roll-back", "agonizing re-appraisal", "massive retaliation", and now we have "measured retaliation". We might sum them up under the title: *policies of provocation.*

What is happening is that Humpty Dumpty, the world of the old empires and cartel divisions is breaking up, and all the king's horses and all the king's men can't put it together again. But palsied hands are groping in the dark and gathering bits and pieces. If they can't perform the miracle of restoring vitality to the old order they may fumble about until they find and press the button of total destruction that will sweep both the old and the new into annihilation.

We walk on the edge of an abyss. The question is: will the socialist nations allow themselves to be provoked into an action which will involve

them in war? Since 1945 the world's peace has depended almost entirely on their restraint, in Korea, in Indo-China, in Berlin, and now in Iran for the second time. But we have proved that there are limits to their acceptance level of provocative acts, for whenever our planes have flown over their territory they have been shot down.

Will this Pearson Formula be used as a further final provocation?

A NEW CHRISTIAN CHURCH

The Institution of the Church:

An institution is a way of life. Fashions, manners, customs, moral codes are institutions. Political and economic systems are institutions.

Every groove in which life runs is an institution.

But, if this were all, there could never be progress or change. So men instituted centers of criticism and judgment, churches, which would stand outside all other institutions and test them, and if necessary shake them out of their grooves. And men made these centers free from state interference, so that *the state* protected the church, yet expected no pity from the church in its criticism of the state.

For men realized that the state would always be in need of criticism and could not be depended upon to criticize itself. The church was permitted, therefore, to exist alongside the state and in the midst of all its other institutions, so that the state would not be without eyes.

Included here under the term church would be all cultural or educational agencies independent of the state and its current ways of life.

The great danger in whose shadow the state has always stood was ingrained habit, habit freezing into secondary instinct, second nature, as we say. Once life should become entirely instinctual it would repeat itself forever. It would become a living death. For life, in the human sense, means change, development.

Therefore the continued existence of true churches, including all free, independent centers of criticism, should be held indispensible to the life of the nation.

We shall speak here more specifically of churches as they are generally recognized today and as they were instituted in the New Testament saying, "Where two or three have gathered in my name, I am among them." (Matt. 18:20).

The true church, then, should be the window of the nation's house. The house should draw air and light through it.

But when the window is bricked up into the wall of the house, the light and air are barred and the people are choked and blinded. That is the case today in all nations. Our churches shore up the *status quo.* They do not open upon vistas of new life. They lead nobody into new places. In capitalist nations they follow the pew where the tycoon sits, blind. In the socialist nations they still suffer from a sense of unworthiness and the memories of past betrayals. For, by and large, they stood in the path of progress, obstacles in its way. And they have not yet become

oriented to the new situation in which they find themselves. It may be extremely difficult, indeed well nigh impossible for them to do so. True churches in these countries will likely spring up out of the creative forces at present absorbed in the physical tasks of getting the new regimes successfully established.

First Condition of Religious Liberty:

If a church wants to be free, the first thing it must do is to forego all subsides from the state and from large beneficiaries of the *status quo.* In other words it must pay taxes like any other private educational institution.

A *Christian* church, remember, is two or three people gathered together in the spirit of Jesus, the Nazarene carpenter-teacher. "Gathered" does not refer necessarily to location in space. They may meet by correspondence. It may be a radio church. A magazine or paper, directed and informed by this spirit, is a church. There are all kinds of churches, some of which would never be recognized by the big official churches. Churches take form and are dissipated every day and in thousands of ways. True churches sometimes take form within false churches. The spirit bloweth where it listeth. It appears never to stay long in one place or under one name.

Now the big churches of today, the ones hailed by service club orators for reducing crime and the insurance rates ,have become in truth an integral part of the state's police force. They give it its sharpest weapon, its ultra respectability. Its head police officer, in the US for instance, has become a haloed saint, beyond criticism.

The same thing has happened with respect to our all-party foreign policy and the heads of government which guide it. It has become sacrosanct. Let nobody be deceived by the sham controversies at election times. The basic policy is never at issue in these debates. The question is only: who will serve it best?

And if a certain religious group steps out of line and dares to criticize that basic policy you may be sure that the government soon comes to the conclusion that this group is not a religious group at all and therefore is not tax-exempt. We have proved this in our own experience. It doesn't matter that the government official who was responsible for this action is in jail for crimes against his own government. *His ruling still* stands. For it is the whole government which spoke in his decision and what it said amounted to this:

You were exempt while your preaching agreed with our policy. Now that you presume to criticize us, we shall tax you.

That is what happened. We collected hundreds of testimonials from recognized religious leaders all over the country to the fact of our true churchmanship. But to no avail.

What is the lesson of all this? It seems to us that it means that true churches should *begin by paying taxes* so that they will never get into

a situation where they become dependent on tax exemption. Freedom is worth paying for. At any rate it appears to be unavailable otherwise.

The constitutions of the USA and of the new socialist republics agree in demanding the separation of church and state. In the socialist republics there is a tapering off of state subsidies to the churches which were carried over from the old regimes, and the churches will not be entirely free until that tapering off period is ended. And tax exemption in the USA remains a string by which the church is still attached to the state. Released Time for church instruction in the state schools is another string, recently invented by those interested in furthering the cause of the totalitarian church-state.

The breaking down of the constitutional barrier between church and state is the *final*, the *ultimate* breach in the wall of democracy. A government may, and frequently does, operate a newspaper or a radio network, but a government in the new democracies and in the United States and Canada, may not operate or establish a church.

The press, like the church, is constitutionally free, yet the press has always been more vulnerable to state influence. But now the church too, without obvious coercion, has joined the police and the armed forces of the state, openly bragging about what it had hitherto been ashamed of.

Life, as civilized men live it, is made up of (1) order and (2) growth. The church and all free cultural groups have to do with a process which sets up a tension within order. Change and growth are dangerous. Strange doctrines may lead to a better order and they may lead to crime. The state until very recent history has punished the teachers of strange doctrines, along with ordinary malefactors, with extraordinary severity. Christ was not the only teacher crucified between two thieves.

It was a venturesome wisdom as well as a deep historical insight which caused the founders of the American Republic to place churches outside the reach of the power-hungry state.

Furthermore, it must never be forgotten that, in the person of these founders it was the state itself which was the guarantor of the church's freedom.

And, just as in the Middle Ages the German Emperors were called upon over and over again to restore order to the Roman Church and to modify its excesses, so today the final recourse (in case the church forfeits or abuses its freedom) must be to the state, in this case not the Empire but the democratic state, and in this case not churches rivalling secular power, but churches some of which at any rate started out as simple free meeting places or gatherings of independents.

It is not in the official churches today that we shall find our salvation. It is rather in the *spirit of the true church*, largely found outside the official churches. Just as it was found among the deist and humanist founders of America (known to the orthodox of their time as atheists) so today we frequently find the essence of this spirit among the undoctrinaire marxists who guide the destinies of the new democracies, for instance in Matyas Rakosi of Hungary, an unsparing critic of the faults and failures of his own party. The tension spoken of above is here to be

found in the breast of a single man who bears the responsibility of leading his people out of one order into another. The leaders of these regimes are forced to serve in the dual role of church and state, makers of order and critics of order. But later, when their democracies have become thoroughly established and the world civil war has been ended, the function of criticism will become of such great importance that it will claim the genius and abilities of men and women who will form associations for that purpose. Then, and not before, we shall have true churches in those countries.

Man shall not live by bread alone. Ants appear to do so, and some men would forego their manhood and emulate the ants. True, we need the boys who will bring home the loaf of bread, but we need the loafer too, who may be Walt Whitman. One Walt Whitman out of ten million loafers is a good average.

Our plea is for true churches, numerous groups of three or four or a dozen, untagged, unpretentious, casual, roaming back through history to gather beauty's shells down the long shores of time, bitterly attacking the injustices that cuff our faces out of each morning's newspaper, standing firm for man's world-encirculing brotherhood, fighting for peace and radiating love through these actions, the love which comes to us we know not whence but in whose validity and ultimate authority we believe.

A handful of people can gather for these purposes anywhere in America and Canada and can be a true church and can speak to the world with all the authority of Synod and Council.

INTERPRETING THE NEWS
By Louise Harding

Who Killed Cock Robin?

Not long before Eisenhower became ill, he stated that it hardly seemed sense to go on making weapons of war, so long as atomic weapons had made armed conflict so dangerous that nations were not going to resort to it. Did this cause a slump in the stock market? Not at all; stocks went on booming. But on announcement of the President's grave heart condition, they dropped with a thud. Looks as though the big financiers had not taken "Ike" seriously. The financial pages have not hesitated to say that the favorable financial condition still prevailing, is based on preparation for war—although even Dulles has said that no great power will now be reckless enough to start another great war.

On July 25, Drew Pearson asserted that

"The Soviets are already far ahead of the U.S. in numbers of advanced fighters in operational service. Soviet engineers have also produced jet engines with a greater thrust than any produced in the U.S. Despite our reputation for mass production, the Soviets have demonstrated they can tool up for mass plane production faster than we have been doing."

The late lamented (by U.S. reaction) czar left Russia with almost no industrial development. This tremendous progress, be it remembered,

has been made under socialism, where profits, rent and interest do not have to be taken into account.

It seems as though the "Geneva spirit" against war might have come about somewhat because the U.S. cartelists had a New Look themselves, after having taken a Good Look at the Moscow war display.

Not to be Robbery, an Exchange Must Be Fair:

The Eisenhower "open skies" proposal was, we learn by the press, not really his, but originated with the Pentagon, who got it from some U.S. magnate whose name your scribe has seen but cannot at the moment recall. About it, Sen. George was frank enough to say that he did not think the Russians would accept it. July 24, UP,

He said Americans live in a 'goldfish bowl' and Russia knows 'pretty well what we are doing.'"

Pearson wrote (Oct. 30),

"....the Pentagon has again locked the stable door after the horse was stolen by restricting a list of American overseas bases, even though the list had already been widely circulated. The Communists already know where these bases are. And the list was previously given to newsmen without any restrictions."

It is a source of strength to Soviet Russia, of course, that their producing centers of war weapons are so largely unknown to U.S. spies.

And belike the "suspicious" Communists recollect that one C.D. Jackson, Henry Luce's man, was until quite lately an important adviser to Mr. Eisenhower, and that the said Jackson advised in 1950, before the Truman "police action" got going, that if Russia could not be provoked into starting a war, *we should.*

It was not too surprising, therefore, that at the "United" Nations, Sept. 1, the Russian representative proposed reduction in the manpower of the respective armies; a ban on atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction when the countries had completed 75 per cent of their agreed arms reduction; an immediate ban on the use of nuclear weapons except for defense against aggression, and so forth.

Eisenhower and Dulles put forth proposals, in July, that in return for acceptance of the exchange of military blueprints, etc., USA would *protect Russia* against aggressors, so that she need not have the slightest fear of Germany rearmed. Further suspicions and objections on the part of the soviets:—could they have had something like Munich in the back of their heads?

At any rate, the Russians would not do as the Americans wanted, so "the spirit of Geneva was killed by the Kremlin" according to the press which represents the views of the two old parties in this great land.

Mr. Dulles is greatly disgruntled. But what could have been more fatuous than to send someone like him to treat with a government whose leading officials are Communist? This man (serving under Democrats and Republicans alike) is one of the world's leading cartelists. An arch-reactionary (and canting hypocrite) who wrote the plank in the Repub-

lican platform endorsing Jakob Kaiser's plan for "rolling back" the Russian frontier toward the east and thus depriving Russia of real (not paper) protection against her enemies, the Allied Capitalists led by a renazified Germany, Dulles maintains the doctrine that propaganda for a new social system is *treason* (to plutocrary): in addressing the U.N. Assembly in October, he objected to "*political* offensives aimed at subverting free governments" (such as Greece, and no doubt Spain). At that time, he asserted that "the perpetuation of this division (of Germany) is a crime against nature." Yet, U.S. reaction set up Syngman Rhee in Korea against the wishes of the people of north and south Korea alike; and it now backs south Vietnam in a refusal to call the elections agreed to by treaty, because there are more people in the north than in the south.

Take a look at Dulles' career to see whether he was a fit emissary to Geneva.

He praised Hitler's Germany, and Mussolini's Italy, as "dynamic young nations", and was still busy in U.S. raising funds for Germany shortly before Hitler actually took over.

According to Drew Pearson, Oct. 1, Dulles proclaimed that "the future of Germany was assured; that it was a sound investment for American bondholders. The American investing public poured in millions. Shortly before Hitler came into power, Dulles publicly reversed his appraisal.

According to the conservative London Daily Telegraph (1/22/52),

> "Mr. Dulles, architect of the Japanese Peace Treaty, told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee today, on asking for its ratification, that the United States must take positive action to assure the downfall of the present Moscow-dominated Government of China. We cannot expect a change in China to take place automatically."

Over C.B.S. radio, Apr. 5, 1952, he said it had been thought crisis in Europe would come in 1952, but since Russia showed a disposition to be accommodating enough to wait for us, perhaps we should not rush remilitarization of western Europe, to the detriment of its economy; *1954 might do as well!*

And—it should not be forgotten—atomic war in Indo-China was actually set on foot by the Eisenhower administration, with planes on the way when they were recalled through the protests of four certain influential individuals: according to Senator Smathers, who never denied that he so stated to the American Legion gathering in Petersburg, Florida.

It was Dulles who encouraged Syngman Rhee, a few days before war broke out in Korea—although he well knew Rhee had been making incendiary remarks through the press, of his intention to attack the north.

And that Rhee did so attack, there is no doubt. Oct. 10, 1953, Rhee's foreign minister in 1950, stated on a radio program in this country that "we *started the war*." In reply to inquiries from the audience, Limb justified this action by claiming that a "burglar" was in the house of Korea, and that it was Rhee's duty to put him out. He dwelt on this at some length.

Aug. 13, 1954, U.S. News & W.R. carried an interview with Rhee, in which he said:

"*We started the fight in the first place in the hope that Communism would be destroyed.*"

(Rhee tried to goad U.S. into starting an atomic war.)

Every attempt at concealment of the truth has been made. When the capable and courageous attorney, Fyke Farmer, sent his daughter to have the Limb record played back, it was regrettably discovered that it had been broken at the place just before Limb "spilled the beans"! The first edition of N.Y. Times, containing the statement from South Korea that its troops were in Haeju early in the morning of July 25, 1950, totally disappeared from the office files of the paper; and later, the Haeju statement appeared as the second paragraph of an item dated July 26. The claim that north Korea was the "aggressor"—in what was in reality a civil war—has been reiterated a million times (the bigger the lie, and the oftener told, the more chance of it being believed, Hitler maintained).

Now, talk of a "police action"—and Truman lied about that: the UN acted hours after Truman had put this country into war without authorization of Congress—has been allowed to die; it is now referred to as a war (even Taft said Truman acted in defiance of the Constitution). Truman got away with it because, as Rhee said, it was a war against Communism; and U.S. Constitution or no, the bi-partisan wings of Capitalism approved of it. Truman must have carted the official record away from Washington—also in defiance of law; and when his Library, containing, we are told, numerous important official records, is opened to the public, one of these fine days, it is safe to say that this document, of tremendous importance to the world, will not be on display—unless falsified.

Shortly before leaving for the "summit conference" at Geneva, Dulles tried to irritate Russia by saying its economic system was "over-extended". —Someone wrote to S. F. Chronicle and said Mr. Dulles was highly unoriginal, because the correspondent seemed to have heard, up to 20,000 times during the last 37 years, that the Soviet government was on its last legs.

"*Free Elections*": William Knowland, "senator from Formosa", where Chiang Kai-shek conducts an atrocious reign of tyranny, with no pretense whatsoever of democracy, wants free elections held in the Soviet "satellites". West German is, industrially, an American satellite—how about some free elections over there? The cartels and clericals have been buying the elections, with their enormous donations; and the people demonstrating against rearmament were driven from the public streets with clubs and fire hoses. A plebiscite on rearmament was forbidden, at the behest of Eisenhower.

—And what about a free election in *Spain*, where Dulles has been sitting cheek by jowl with Butcher Franco? An item from Madrid, Nov. 1, reads:

"The Spanish Foreign Affairs Ministry said in a communique tonight that Dulles and Franco "found themselves in mutual understanding" on the principal problems which affect the peace and securi-

ty of the free nations."... "In an impromptu speech over the Spanish radio before his return to Geneva, Dulles said the talks would serve to make U.S.—Spanish relations 'even closer'.

"The free nations"!

Speaking of Franco Spain, that reminds one of something else about the Farben murder-concern. "Treason's Peace", by Howard W. Ambruster, says:

"The senior vom Rath had a nephew, Georg von Schnitzler, who stayed at the royal court to rise high in the Farben dynasty. Von Schnitzler was a brother-in-law of the famous, or notorious, General Fedor von Bock who led the Nazi armies to defeat in Russia, got back with a whole skin, to be shot down by the British near Hamburg as the war was ending in 1945.

"Georg von Schnitzler, as a managing director of Farben, became one of its most powerful rulers; he was a heavy financial contributor to Hitler's rise from the gutter, and in his handling of Farben's foreign tie-ups, camouflage and espionage, he appears as among a half dozen of the most dangerous of Germany's war criminals.

In 1943 von Schnitzler, knowing the war was lost, established a residence in Madrid—a veritable castle in Spain—where he could keep and renew his close friendships and carry over alliances with leading American cartelists, to begin the repair of Farben's war-damaged foreign empire and preparations for World War III."

Farben bloodstained money, we may be quite sure, has been behind the network of spies and saboteurs which has been operating in West Germany. The Gehlen outfit aroused the hatred of the Social Democrats because of its exposed plan to assinitate the S.D. leaders. The following item came from Bonn, July 20, 1955:

"The West German government informed parliament today of its plans to take over the American-financed international spy network headed by former Lieutenant General Reinhard Gehlen. It will become the Weste German Federal Intelligence Service, operating on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

"Financed for the last eight years with up to $6,000,000 of U.S. funds, the Gehlen organization has 4000 agents, some operating as far east as Siberia.

"The Service will be attached to the office of Chancellor Konrad Adenauer to whom political reports will be submitted directly. Military reports will go both to Adenauer and Supreme Allied Headquarters in Europe near Paris."

NEW CHRISTIAN

DEC. 1955

EDITOR
Kenneth Leslie

ASSOCIATE EDITOR
Rev. John Tunnicliffe

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

Archbishop Adam
Rev. William T. Baird
Rev. Russell C. Barbour
Rev. Reginald H. Bass
Rev. C. Harrison Becker
Bishop Albert Bereczky
Henrietta Buckmaster
Rev. R. Alex Cameron
Rev. Boise Dent
Bishop Laszlo Dezsery
Rev. I Jonathan Domas
Rev. H. deM. DuBois
Rev. Merlin W. Ennis
Rev. Stanley Evans
Rev. John Fekete
Rev. Joseph F. Fletcher
Rev. Erwin A. Gaede
Rev. Sidney E. Harris
Rev. A. Eustace Haydon
Rev. Daniel Hughes
Rev. Hewlett Johnson
Rev. Imre Kadar
Rev. J. Spencer Kennard
Rev. Ferenc H. Kiss
John A. Lee
Rev. E. D. McGowan
Prof. John Macmurray
Rev. John A. Maynard
Rev. Laszlo Michnay
Rev. Joseph G. Moore
Rev. J. Murdock Palmer
Bishop John Peter
Ida Pruit
Leslie Roberts
Rev. R. Ross-Shannon
Watson Thomson
Bishop Lajos Veto
Rev. Wilfred Wakefield
Rev. Etienne Watts
Prof. Henry N. Wieman
Rev. Claude Williams
Rev. Mercer Wilson

NEW CHRISTIAN is published monthly by New Christian Books, 95 Argyle Street, Halifax, Nova Scotia. By subscription only. 12 issues $3.25. Checks and money orders payable to **New Christian Books. No Agents.**